

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 6,574,487).

Claims 7-22 and 29-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Kaneko (US 2002/0176036).

Claims 1-44 stand rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Kim et al. (US 7,015,989).

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are pending.

Specification Objections

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39, thereby rendering the objection to the Specification moot.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Accordingly, Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39, thereby rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, moot.

Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-44 stand rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Kim et al. (US 7,015,989). Applicants concurrently submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the rejection of claims 1-44 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-44 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 6,574,487), and claims 7-22 and 29-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Kaneko (US 2002/0176036). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on grounds that the applied references, whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 21, 27, and 33 and 21, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-20, 22-26, 28-32, and 34-40.

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 34, as amended, recite an LCD device/method including, in part, first and second front light units that are “disposed at opposite sides of the liquid crystal panel” and that “overlap each other with the liquid crystal panel disposed therebetween.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Smith et al. explicitly requires light sources 72 and 74 disposed on top and bottom portions 62 and 66, respectively, of the display 12 *without overlapping with the display 12 disposed therebetween*. Thus, Smith et al. fails to teach or suggest that the light sources overlap and that the display is disposed between the overlapping of the light sources, as required by amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, 23,

29, and 39, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-16, 24-28, 30-38, and 40-44.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Kaneko fails to remedy the deficiencies of Smith et al., as detailed above, since Kaneko is completely silent with regard to overlapping multiple light sources positioned at opposing sides of a liquid crystal panel, as required by amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-16, 24-28, 30-38, and 40-44. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Smith et al. and Kaneko fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 1-44.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully asserts that claims 1-44 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: December 7, 2006

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000